

112037

Meeting Notes: INGAA/OPS Pipeline Integrity Management Meeting

March 29 & 30, 2000

DO SEP 23 AM 11:03

Napa, California

Attendees

RSPA-00-7666-41

Terry Boss	INGAA
Beth Callsen	OPS
Henry Cialone	Battelle
Andy Drake	Duke Energy
Alan Eastman	PG&E
Randy Eckert	Williams
Joseph Finnan	PA PUC - Gas Safety
G. Tom Fortner	OPS
Mike Israni	OPS
Mahendra Jhala	CA PUC
Dave Johnson	Enron
Frederick A. Joyner	OPS
Keith Leewis	GRI
Brian Leis	Battelle
Hossein Monfared *	CA State Fire Marshal
Bob Moody	CMS Energy
Daron Moore	El Paso Energy
Wade Nguyen	OPS
Joe Robertson	Williams
Rod Seeley	OPS
Dorian Stansberry *	Cycla/OPS
Paul Wood	Cycla/OPS
Jim Wunderlin	Southwest Gas
John Zurcher	Columbia Gas

Note: * Indicates presence on the second day only.

Purpose

This meeting is one of a series of meetings between OPS and State regulators and the gas pipeline industry on how best to add protection to pipeline segments in high consequence areas (HCAs). The intended outcome of these meetings is a *technical basis document* developed by industry and docketed in support of a rulemaking. The major areas of discussion during the meeting were a) "probability and consequence analysis" of gas pipeline accidents intended to focus on the features of any integrity problem areas, b) treatment of high population density areas in the current code (Part 192), c) thoughts on the definition of high consequence areas, and d)

current integrity management practices. In addition INGAA arranged for a tour of the Napa Pipe production facility to provide some insight into the manufacturing process.

Meeting Content

The meeting began with the gas pipeline industry providing an overview of the various studies underway:

1. Probability and consequences of gas pipeline accidents
2. Basic design, construction, operation, and maintenance principles contained in the current regulations
3. Protections for high population regions inherent in existing gas pipeline regulations relative to protections in hazardous liquid pipeline regulations
4. Definition of High Consequence Areas
5. Summary of current preventive and mitigative practices in the industry based on the industry interpretation of Part 192 and practices beyond these requirements
6. Future technology enhancements being pursued
7. Comments for OPS consideration during development of the integrity rule

Probability and Consequences Analysis. The industry presented data on the probability and consequences of past gas pipeline accidents. In this presentation the data were primarily from interstate transmission lines, but touched on intrastate transmission.

The Code and Current Integrity Assurance. Industry described the basic features of the integrity margin built into the current code. The industry provided an analysis of the increased level of assurance associated with the integrity of gas pipelines in high population zones (resulting from greater wall thickness required by class location regulations), and the time this higher assurance should make available to implement other proven integrity assurance technologies.

Definition of High Consequence Areas. The industry discussed concepts for defining high consequence areas (HCA). This began with a review of the current approach used in Class Location regulations to define population in affected zones near gas pipelines. The definition of HCAs for gas pipelines will be dominated by the presence of higher population densities. The industry believes the HCA definition should be simple, supported by available data, defensible, and should consider both the size of pipe and the operating pressure within the pipe.

Summary of current preventive and mitigative practices in the industry based on the industry interpretation of Part 192 and practices beyond these requirements. The industry gave a brief presentation on efforts to examine current operating and maintenance practice within the industry.

The group then adjourned to tour the Napa Pipe facility. The next meeting is scheduled for April 19 and 20 in Columbus, Ohio.